arXiv:1704.03843v1 [math.GN] 12 Apr 2017

INTERNAL CHARACTERIZATIONS OF PRODUCTIVELY LINDELÖF SPACES

LEANDRO F. AURICHI[1] AND LYUBOMYR ZDOMSKYY[2]

Abstract. We present an internal characterization for the productively Lindelöf property, thus answering a long-standing problem attributed to Tamano. We also present some results about the relation "Alster spaces" *vs.* "productively Lindelöf spaces".

1. Introduction

We say that a topological space is Lindelöf if every open covering for it has a countable subcovering. We say that a Lindelöf space X is a productively Lindelöf space if $X \times Y$ is Lindelöf for every Lindelöf space Y. This is a class that contains all σ-compact spaces but we do not know yet much more about which other spaces are in it. For example, it is not know if the space of the irrationals is productively Lindelöf - although consistently it is not, see [6] and references therein.

As with the case of the irrationals, most of the known results about productively Lindelöf spaces use some kind of combinatorial hypothesis beyond ZFC (see e.g. [1, 6]). So this property seems to have a set-theoretic nature.

In the second section, we will present an internal characterization of the class of productively Lindelöf spaces, which solves a problem attributed to H. Tamano in [7]. The formulation of the property is combinatorial.

In the third section we present some new results about the relation "Alster spaces" (defined bellow) *vs* "productively Lindelöf spaces". In particular, we obtain the original Alster's result ([2]) as a corollary. This gives a simplification compared to the original proof. Alster's result is probably the best known one regarding productively spaces in general. The result presented here has the advantage that the set-theoretic assumption in it is much weaker than CH.

Finally, in the fourth section, we present a new property which is (formally) in between Alster and productively Lindelöf ones. One of the applications of this property is that it makes the relation between the properties of Alster and Hurewicz more clear.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 54D20, 54A35; Secondary: 03E17.

Key words and phrases. (Productively) Lindelöf space, Alster space, Michael space, Menger property.

[1] The first author was partially supported by FAPESP (2013/05469-7 and 2015/25725). A part of the results were obtained during the visit of the first author of the Kurt Gödel Center at the University of Vienna in January 2017 partially supported by the FWF Grant I 1209-N25.

[2] The second author would like to thank the Austrian Science Fund FWF (Grants I 1209-N25 and I 2374-N35) for generous support for this research.

2. An internal characterizations for productively Lindelöf spaces

The internal formulation (pL) is presented in the first subsection, where it is also showed that if the space is productively Lindelöf, then pL holds. Then, in the second subsection, we show that pL, together with a certain technical property, is enough to prove that a space is productively Lindelöf. After that, in the third subsection, we finally show that every regular space has that technical property, concluding the main result (Theorem 2.13). Finally, in the last subsection we discuss some cases when this characterization can be extended for spaces that are not regular.

2.1. **A topology over open coverings.** Let (X,τ) be a topological space. We denote by O the collection of all open coverings of X. Given a finite $F\subset\tau$, we use the following notation:

$$F^*=\{\mathcal{U}\in \mathrm{O} : F\subset\mathcal{U}\}.$$

Note that, since $F^*\cap G^*=(F\cup G)^*$, the collection $\{F^* : F\subset\tau \text{ is finite}\}$ is a base for a topology over O. Also, note that for any $\mathcal{U}\in\mathrm{O}$, $\{F^* : F\subset\mathcal{U} \text{ is finite}\}$ is a local base for $\mathcal{U}$. Therefore, the following definition is just a translation of the Lindelöfness property of subsets of O:

Definition 2.1. *Let (X,τ) be a topological space. We say that $\mathcal{Y}\subset\mathrm{O}$ is a* **Lindelöf collection** *if, for every $f:\mathcal{Y}\to[\bigcup\mathcal{Y}]^{<\omega}$ such that $f(\mathcal{U})\subset\mathcal{U}$ for all $\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{Y}$, there is a sequence $(\mathcal{U}_n)_{n\in\omega}$ of coverings in $\mathcal{Y}$ such that for every $\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{Y}$, there is an $n\in\omega$ such that $f(\mathcal{U}_n)\subset\mathcal{U}$.*

If we cover $X\times\mathcal{Y}$ in such a way that each $(x,\mathcal{U})\in A\times\{A\}^*$ for some $A\in\mathcal{U}$ with $x\in A$, then the Lindelöf property of $X\times\mathcal{Y}$ would imply that there is a sequence $(A_n)_{n\in\omega}$ that is enough to cover the whole $X\times\mathcal{Y}$. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 2.2. *Let (X,τ) be a topological space. We say that X has the* **pL property** *if, for every Lindelöf collection $\mathcal{Y}\subset\mathrm{O}$, there is a sequence $(A_n)_{n\in\omega}$ of open sets such that, for each $(x,\mathcal{U})\in X\times\mathcal{Y}$ there is some $n\in\omega$ such that $x\in A_n\in\mathcal{U}$.*

After the comments above, it is easy to see the following:

Proposition 2.3. *Let (X,τ) be a topological space. If X is productively Lindelöf, then X has the pL property.*

In the following, we will discuss when the pL property implies a space to be productively Lindelöf.

2.2. **From Y to $\mathcal{Y}$.** Let (X,τ) and (Y,ρ) be topological spaces. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an open covering of $X\times Y$ made by basic open sets. For each $y\in Y$, define $\mathcal{U}_y=\{U\in\tau :$ there is a $V\in\rho$ such that $U\times V\in\mathcal{W}$ and $y\in V\}$. Note that each $\mathcal{U}_y$ is an element of O. We define $\mathcal{Y}=\{\mathcal{U}_y : y\in Y\}$ with the topology defined as before. Note that $\mathcal{Y}$ depends on $\mathcal{W}$, but we will not mark this dependency unless necessary.

Proposition 2.4. *If $\mathcal{W}$ is an open covering of $X\times Y$ and Y is Lindelöf, then $\mathcal{Y}$ is Lindelöf.*

Proof. For each $\mathcal{U}_y$, let $\{U^y_1,...,U^y_{n_y}\}\subset\mathcal{U}_y$ (thus $\mathcal{U}_y\in\{U^y_1,...,U^y_{n_y}\}^*$). By the definition of $\mathcal{U}_y$, for each U^y_i, there is a V^y_i such that $y\in V^y_i$ and $U^y_i\times V^y_i\in\mathcal{W}$. Define $V_y=\bigcap_{i=1}^{n_y}V^y_i$. Since Y is Lindelöf, there is a sequence $(y_k)_{k\in\omega}$ such that

$Y \subset \bigcup_{k\in\omega} V_{y_k}$. Let us prove that $(\{U_1^{y_k}, ..., U_{n_{y_k}}^{y_k}\}^*)_{k\in\omega}$ is a covering of $\mathcal{Y}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Let $k \in \omega$ such that $y \in V_{y_k} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n_{y_k}} V_i^{y_k}$. So, by definition of $\mathcal{U}_y$, each $U_i^{y_k} \in \mathcal{U}_y$, which means that $\mathcal{U}_y \in \{U_1^{y_k}, ..., U_{n_{y_k}}^{y_k}\}^*$ and thus this completes our proof. □

Now we will investigate when the pL property applied to $\mathcal{Y}$ is enough to guarantee that $\mathcal{W}$ has a countable subcovering. For this, the following definitions will be helpful:

Definition 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a covering of $X \times Y$ made by basic open sets. Then we say that $\mathcal{W}$ is an* **injective covering** *if whenever $A \times B, A' \times B' \in \mathcal{W}$, then $A = A'$ implies $B = B'$. We say that $\mathcal{W}$ is an* **ω-injective covering** *if, for every A, the set $\{B : A \times B \in \mathcal{W}\}$ is at most countable.*

Lemma 2.6. *Let X and Y be Lindelöf spaces and let $\mathcal{W}$ be an ω-injective covering of $X \times Y$. If X has the pL property, then $\mathcal{W}$ has a countable subcovering.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be such as before Proposition 2.4. The latter implies that $\mathcal{Y}$ is a Lindelöf collection. Let $(A_n)_{n\in\omega}$ be given by the pL property. For each A_n, let $(B_n^m)_{m\in\omega}$ be an enumeration of all open sets $B \subset Y$ such that $A_n \times B \in \mathcal{W}$. We will show that $X \times Y \subset \bigcup_{n,m\in\omega} A_n \times B_n^m$. Let $(x, y) \in X \times Y$. Let $n \in \omega$ be such that $x \in A_n \in \mathcal{U}_y$. Note that, since $A_n \in \mathcal{U}_y$, there is a B such that $y \in B$ and $A_n \times B \in \mathcal{W}$. Thus there is an m such that $B_n^m = B$, and therefore $(x, y) \in A_n \times B_n^m$. □

Note that if $X \times Y$ is Lindelöf, then every open covering of $X \times Y$ has an ω-injective refinement (just go for a countable refinement made by basic open sets). Therefore, the following result is an easy consequence of the previous ones:

Theorem 2.7. *Let X be a Lindelöf space. Then X is productively Lindelöf if, and only if, X has the pL property and, for every Lindelöf Y and every $\mathcal{W}$ covering for $X \times Y$, there is an ω-injective refinement for $\mathcal{W}$.*

Thus, for every class of spaces such that it is always possible to find ω-injective refinements as above, the productively Lindelöf property is equivalent to the pL property. In the following we will discuss such classes of spaces.

2.3. **Getting ω-injective refinements.** The objective of this section is to show that it is possible to find ω-injective refinements for every regular spaces. But some of the results of this section will be also used in the next section where we consider non-regular spaces.

Lemma 2.8. *Let X and Y be any spaces, where Y is Lindelöf and X is T_1. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an open covering of $X \times Y$ and let $\mathcal{B}$ be a base for X. Then there is an open refinement $\mathcal{R}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ such that every element of $\mathcal{R}$ is of the form $B \times C$ where $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $|\{C : B \times C \in \mathcal{R}\}| \leq |B| + \aleph_0$.*

Proof. For every isolated point $x \in X$ let us fix a countable open covering $\mathcal{C}_x$ of Y such that for each element of $\{\{x\} \times C : C \in \mathcal{C}_x\}$ there is an element of $\mathcal{W}$ containing it. Set $\mathcal{R}_0 = \{\{x\} \times C : x \in X$ is isolated and $C \in \mathcal{C}_x\}$.

Now let κ be an infinite cardinal. We define $X_\kappa = \{x \in X : \kappa$ is the least ρ such that there is a $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in B$ and $|B| = \rho\}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\kappa = \{B \in \mathcal{B} : |B| = \kappa\}$.

Let $\{x_\xi : \xi < \lambda\}$ be an enumeration of X_κ. Let M_0 be an elementary submodel such that $x_0, X, Y, \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{B} \in M_0$, and $|M_0| = \kappa$. Then $A \subset M_0$ for every $A \in M_0$ with $|A| \leq \kappa$. Let

$$\mathcal{R}_0^\kappa = \{B \times C \in M_0 : B \times C \text{ refines } \mathcal{W} \text{ and } B \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa\}.$$

Note that $|\mathcal{R}_0^\kappa| \leq \kappa$.

Claim 2.9. *If $x \in X_\kappa$ and there is a $B \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa$ such that $B \times C \in \mathcal{R}_0^\kappa$ for some C, then $\{x\} \times Y \subset \bigcup \mathcal{R}_0^\kappa$.*

Proof. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa$ be such that $x \in B$ and $B \times C \in \mathcal{R}_0^\kappa$. Since $|B| = \kappa$, $B \subset M_0$. Thus, since Y is Lindelöf, there is a sequence $(B_n \times C_n)_{n\in\omega}$ covering $\{x\} \times Y$, refining $\mathcal{W}$, and such that $B_n \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa$ for all $n \in \omega$. By elementarity, we may suppose that this sequence is in M_0 and, therefore, each $B_n \times C_n \in \mathcal{R}_0^\kappa$ which proves the claim. □

Now let x_ξ be the first one such that x_ξ is not covered by any B such that $B \times C \in \mathcal{R}_0^\kappa$ for some C. Let M_ξ be an elementary submodel as before, but this time containing x_ξ. Define

$$R_\xi^\kappa = \{B \times C \in M_\xi : B \in \mathcal{B}_\kappa, B \setminus A \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B \times C \text{ refines } \mathcal{W}\}$$

where A is the collection of all $x \in X$ that are covered by some B that $B \times C \in \mathcal{R}_0^\kappa$ for some C.

Note that, again, $|R_\xi^\kappa| \leq \kappa$. Also, if $B \times C \in \mathcal{R}_0^\kappa$ and $B' \times C' \in \mathcal{R}_\xi^\kappa$, then $B \neq B'$. Finally, note that the analogous of the Claim for $\mathcal{R}_\xi^\kappa$ also holds. Thus, we can proceed like this until there is no $x_\eta \in X_\kappa$ not covered. Then, define $\mathcal{R}_\kappa = \bigcup_{\xi<\lambda} \mathcal{R}_\xi^\kappa$ (if $\mathcal{R}_\xi^\kappa$ was not defined, just let it be empty). Finally, note that $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{\kappa<|X|} \mathcal{R}_\kappa$ is the refinement we were looking for. □

Lemma 2.10. *Let X be a T_1 space without isolated points and $\mathcal{B}$ be a base of X such that there are no different $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ with $|A \Delta B|$ finite. Then for every Lindelöf space Y and every $\mathcal{W}$ covering for $X \times Y$ there is an injective refinement of $\mathcal{W}$.*

Proof. First, applying Lemma 2.8, we may suppose that every element of $\mathcal{W}$ is of the form $B \times C$ with $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and such that

$$|\{C : B \times C \in \mathcal{W}\}| \leq |B|$$

for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$. For each C such that $B \times C \in \mathcal{W}$, select different $b_C, d_C \in B$ in such a way that $\{b_C, d_C\} \cap \{b_{C'}, d_{C'}\} = \emptyset$ if $C \neq C'$. Note that $\{(B \setminus \{b_C\}) \times C, (B \setminus \{d_C\}) \times C\}$ refines $B \times C$. Also, note that if we repeat this process with all the infinite elements of $\mathcal{B}$, we get an injective refinement. □

Lemma 2.11. *Any regular space with no isolated points has a base $\mathcal{B}$ such that there are no different $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $|A \Delta B| < \aleph_0$.*

Proof. Note that the regular open sets form a base. Also, note that, if A and B are different regular open sets, then $A \Delta B \supset (A \setminus \overline{B}) \bigcup (B \setminus \overline{A})$, and the latter is a non-empty open set. Since X has no isolated points, this set is infinite. □

Lemma 2.12. *Let X be a scattered T_1 space and let Y be a Lindelöf space. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an open covering for $X \times Y$. Then there is an ω-injective open refinement of $\mathcal{W}$.*

Proof. Let X_0 be the set of all isolated points of X. Then, let X_ξ be the set of all isolated points of $X \setminus \bigcup_{\eta<\xi} X_\eta$.

For every $x \in X_\xi$, since Y is Lindelöf, we can find $(A_n^x \times B_n^x)_{n\in\omega}$ that is a refinement of $\mathcal{W}$ that covers $\{x\}\times Y$. We may also assume that $A_n^x \setminus \{x\} \subset \bigcup_{\eta<\xi} X_\eta$ for all $x \in X_\xi$ and $n \in \omega$, i.e., $X_\xi \cap A_n^x = \{x\}$. Note that the union of all $(A_n^x \times B_n^x)$'s covers the whole $X \times Y$ and that this is ω-injective since $A_n^x \neq A_m^y$ if $x \neq y$. □

Combining Lemmata 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, we obtain our main result:

Theorem 2.13. *For every regular Lindelöf space, X is productively Lindelöf if, and only if, X has the pL property.*

2.4. **Non regular spaces.** Even for non regular spaces we can obtain the same characterization. For a space X we denote by $kc(X)$ the minimal cardinality of a covering of X by its compact subspaces. Note that if Y is Lindelöf then any open covering of $X \times Y$ has a subcovering of size $\leq kc(X)$.

Lemma 2.14. *Let X and Y be Lindelöf spaces, with X being T_1 and such that every open subset of X has cardinality at least $kc(X)$. Then every open covering $\mathcal{W}$ of $X \times Y$ has an injective refinement $\mathcal{W}'$ consisting of standard basic open subsets of $X \times Y$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{B}$ is a base for X, then we may additionally assume that any $W \in \mathcal{W}'$ has the form $(B \setminus \{x\}) \times V$ for some $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $x \in X$, and open $V \subset Y$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\mathcal{W}$ consists of standard basic open subsets of $X \times Y$ and $|\mathcal{W}| \leq kc(X) = \kappa$. Let us write $\mathcal{W}$ in the form $(A_\xi \times B_\xi)_{\xi<\kappa}$. We will construct two sequences $(x_\xi^1)_{\xi<\kappa}$, $(x_\xi^2)_{\xi<\kappa}$ of elements of X in such a way that for every $\xi < \kappa$ we have the following properties:

(1) $x_\xi^i \in A_\xi$ for $i = 1, 2$;
(2) $x_\xi^1 \neq x_\xi^2$;
(3) $A_\xi \setminus \{x_\xi^i\} \neq A_\eta \setminus \{x_\eta^j\}$ for every $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and every $\eta < \xi$.

This is easily done by induction by our assumption on the cardinality of A_ξ. Now note that $\{(A_\xi \setminus \{x_\xi^i\}) \times B_\xi : \xi < \kappa \text{ and } i = 1, 2\}$ is the refinement we were looking for. □

Corollary 2.15. *Let X be a Lindelöf T_1 space such that every open subset has cardinality at least $kc(X)$. Then X is productively Lindelöf if, and only if, X has the pL property.*

Proof. It follows directly from Theorem 2.7 and Lemma 2.14. □

Proposition 2.16. *Let X be a Lindelöf T_1 space of size $\aleph_1$ and let Y be a Lindelöf space. Then, for every $\mathcal{W}$ covering for $X \times Y$, there is an ω-injective refinement.*

Proof. Let X' be the collection of all points of X that have a countable neighborhood. Let $\mathcal{W}'$ be a an ω-injective refinement for $X' \times Y$ given by the Lemma 2.8. Note that $X'' = X \setminus X'$ is closed and, therefore, Lindelöf. Thus we can do the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.14 and get $\mathcal{W}''$ an injective refinement for $X'' \times Y$ (note that for each open set, in the argument of the Lemma we can remove points from X'). Thus, $\mathcal{W}' \cup \mathcal{W}''$ is the refinement we were looking for. □

Corollary 2.17. *Let X be a Lindelöf T_1 space of size $\aleph_1$. Then X is productively Lindelöf if, and only if, X has the pL property.*

3. About Alster coverings

For this section and the next one, we need some more definitions:

Definition 3.1. *Let X be a topological space. We say that $\mathcal{G}$ is an* **Alster covering** *for X if each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ is a G_δ set and, for every compact $K \subset X$, there is a $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $K \subset G$. We say that X is an* **Alster space** *if every Alster covering has a countable subcovering.*

In this section, we present a generalization of the following:

Theorem 3.2 (Alster [2])**.** *Suppose CH. Let X be a Tychonoff space with weight $\leq \aleph_1$. Then X is productively Lindelöf if, and only if, for every Alster covering, there is a countable subcovering,* i.e.*, X is an Alster space.*

In the following, we use the standard notation $I = [0, 1]$. Our main result in this section is the following:

Theorem 3.3. *Let $X \subset I^{\omega_1}$ be a productively Lindelöf Menger space and $\mathcal{G}$ be an Alster covering of X of size $|\mathcal{G}| = \omega_1$ consisting of Lindelöf G_δ-subsets of I^{ω_1}. Then there exists $\mathcal{G}' \in [\mathcal{G}]^\omega$ such that $X \subset \bigcup \mathcal{G}'$.*

First, note that if a space is an Alster space, then it is productively Lindelöf. This is the "easy" part of Theorem 3.2 in [2]. Also, note that any Tychonoff space X with weight $\leq \aleph_1$ can be viewed as a subspace of I^{ω_1} and, under CH, given any Alster covering, there is a refinement of size $\aleph_1$ for this covering made by compact G_δ-subsets of I^{ω_1}. Finally, under CH, every productively Lindelöf space is Menger ([8, Proposition 3.1]), since there is a Michael space. With this, we obtain that Theorem 3.2 follows from Theorem 3.3.

Before proving Theorem 3.3 let us draw some corollaries from it.

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose that there exists a Michael space. Let $X \subset I^{\omega_1}$ be a productively Lindelöf space and $\mathcal{G}$ be an Alster covering of X of size $|\mathcal{G}| = \omega_1$ consisting of Lindelöf G_δ-subsets of I^{ω_1}. Then there exists $\mathcal{G}' \in [\mathcal{G}]^\omega$ such that $X \subset \bigcup \mathcal{G}'$.*

Proof. By [8, Proposition 3.1] there exists a Michael space if and only if all productively Lindelöf spaces are Menger. □

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{b} = \omega_1$ or $cov(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{d}$. Let $X \subset I^{\omega_1}$ be a productively Lindelöf space and $\mathcal{G}$ be an Alster covering of X of size $|\mathcal{G}| = \omega_1$ consisting of Lindelöf G_δ-subsets of I^{ω_1}. Then there exists $\mathcal{G}' \in [\mathcal{G}]^\omega$ such that $X \subset \bigcup \mathcal{G}'$.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{b} = \omega_1$ or $cov(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{d}$, then there exists a Michael space. More precisely, its existence under $\mathfrak{b} = \omega_1$ follows by an almost literal repetition of Michael's proof [5] that ω^ω is not productively Lindelöf under CH, and the case $cov(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{d}$ has been treated in [6, Theorem 2.2]. □

We shall divide the proof of Theorem 3.3 into a sequence of lemmas. For every $\alpha \in \omega_1$ we shall denote by p_α the projection map from I^{ω_1} to I^α, i.e., $p_\alpha : (x_\xi)_{\xi<\omega_1} \mapsto (x_\xi)_{\xi<\alpha}$. Let us denote by $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ the family of open subsets of I^{ω_1} of the form $\prod_{\xi\in\omega_1} U_\xi$, where $U_\xi = I$ for all $\xi \notin F$ for some finite $F \subset \alpha$, and U_ξ is an interval with rational end-points for all $\xi \in F$. Thus $\mathcal{B} := \bigcup_{\alpha\in\omega_1} \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ is the standard base for the topology on I^{ω_1}.

The following fact may be thought of as folklore.

Lemma 3.6. *A G_δ subset G of I^{ω_1} is Lindelöf if, and only if, there exists $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that $G = p_\beta^{-1}[p_\beta[G]]$ for all $\beta \geq \alpha$.*

Proof. For the "if" part note that $G = p_\alpha^{-1}[p_\alpha[G]]$ implies $G = p_\alpha[G] \times I^{\omega_1 \setminus \alpha}$, i.e., G is a product of a metrizable separable space and a compact space. Such products are obviously Lindelöf.

Let us prove now the "only if" part. Write G in the form $\bigcap_{n\in\omega} U_n$, where U_n is open. Given any $y \in G$ and $n \in \omega$, fix $B(y,n) \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $y \in B(y,n) \subset U_n$. Let $\alpha(y,n)$ be such that $B(y,n) \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha(y,n)}$. Since G is Lindelöf there exists a countable $Y \subset G$ such that $G \subset \bigcup_{y\in Y} B(y,n)$ for all $n \in \omega$. Then $G = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup_{y\in Y} B(y,n)$. It is easy to see that $\alpha = \sup\{\alpha(y,n) : y \in Y, n \in \omega\} + 1$ is as required. □

We shall need the following result which is a direct consequence of [1, Corollary 2.5].

Proposition 3.7. *Let Z be a metrizable space and $\{A_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ be an increasing covering of Z such that for every compact $K \subset Z$ there exists $\alpha \in \omega_1$ with the property $K \subset A_\alpha$. If $A_\xi \neq Z$ for all ξ, then Z is not productively Lindelöf.*

We shall call $A \subset I^{\omega_1}$ *big* if $A \cap X$ is not covered by any countable subfamily of $\mathcal{G}$. If X is not big then there is nothing to prove. So we shall assume that X is big in the sequel.

Lemma 3.8. *For every big closed subspace Z of X and $\alpha \in \omega_1$ there exists a compact $K \subset p_\alpha[Z]$ such that $Z \cap p_\alpha^{-1}[K]$ is big.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ and $A_\beta = p_\alpha[Z] \setminus p_\alpha[Z \setminus \bigcup_{\xi<\beta} G_\xi]$. If there is no compact $K \subset p_\alpha[Z]$ such that $Z \cap p_\alpha^{-1}[K]$ is big, then $\{A_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\}$ is easily seen to be an increasing covering of $p_\alpha[Z]$ such that for every compact $K \subset p_\alpha[Z]$ there exists $\xi \in \omega_1$ with the property $K \subset A_\xi$, and $A_\xi \neq p_\alpha[Z]$ for all ξ because Z is big. Now Proposition 3.7 implies that $p_\alpha[Z]$ is not productively Lindelöf, a contradiction. □

For a topological space Z we shall denote by $\mathrm{O}(Z)$ the family of all open coverings of Z. For a subspace T of Z we shall denote by $\mathrm{cl}_Z(T)$ the closure of T in Z.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $A \subset X$ be a big Lindelöf subspace. Then there exists $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that for every $\beta > \alpha$ there exists an open covering $\mathcal{W}_\beta$ of $p_\beta[A]$ such that $A \setminus p_\beta^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}]$ is big for all $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{W}_\beta]^{<\omega}$.*

Proof. Suppose that contrary to our claim the set Λ of all $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that for every open covering $\mathcal{W}$ of $p_\alpha[A]$ there exists $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{W} \in [\mathcal{W}]^{<\omega}$ for which $A \setminus p_\alpha^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{W}]$ is *not* big, is cofinal in ω_1. For every $\alpha \in \Lambda$ the set $K_\alpha = \bigcap_{\mathcal{W}\in\mathrm{O}(p_\alpha[A])} \mathrm{cl}_{p_\alpha[A]}(\cup\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{W})$ is a compact subspace of $p_\alpha[A]$. Since $p_\alpha[A]$ is metrizable separable, there exists a countable $\mathsf{W}_\alpha \subset \mathrm{O}(p_\alpha[A])$ such that $K_\alpha = \bigcap_{\mathcal{W}\in\mathsf{W}_\alpha} \mathrm{cl}_{p_\alpha[A]}(\cup\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{W})$. Since for every $\mathcal{W} \in \mathsf{W}_\alpha$ the set $A \setminus p_\alpha^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{W}]$ is not big, so is the set

$$A \setminus p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha] = A \setminus \bigcap_{\mathcal{W}\in\mathsf{W}_\alpha} p_\alpha^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{W}] = \bigcup_{\mathcal{W}\in\mathsf{W}_\alpha} (A \setminus p_\alpha^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{W}])$$

because non-big sets are obviously closed under countable unions. Therefore

$$\bigcup_{\alpha\in\Lambda\cap\gamma} (A \setminus p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha]) = A \setminus \bigcap_{\alpha\in\Lambda\cap\gamma} p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha]$$

is not big for every $\gamma \in \omega_1$, and hence $A \cap \bigcap_{\alpha\in\Lambda\cap\gamma} p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha]$ is big for every $\gamma \in \omega_1$. Note that $K := \bigcap_{\alpha\in\Lambda} p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha]$ is a compact subspace of I^{ω_1}. Since $K_\alpha \subset p_\alpha[A]$ for all $\alpha \in \Lambda$ and A is Lindelöf, we have that $K \subset A$ (suppose there is a $k \in K\setminus A$. Note that $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha<\omega_1}$ is an open covering for A, where each $U_\alpha = \{a \in A : a(\alpha) \neq k(\alpha)\}$. But such a covering cannot have a countable subcovering since $p_\alpha(k) \in p_\alpha[A]$ for every $\alpha \in \omega_1$). Thus there exists $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $K \subset G$, and hence $\{A\setminus p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha] : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ is an open covering of $A \setminus G$. Since A is Lindelöf, so is $A \setminus G$ being an F_σ-subset of a Lindelöf space, and hence $A \setminus G \subset \bigcup_{\alpha\in\Lambda\cap\gamma}(A \setminus p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha])$ for some $\gamma < \omega_1$. Therefore $G \supset A\cap\bigcap_{\alpha\in\Lambda\cap\gamma} p_\alpha^{-1}[K_\alpha]$ which means that the latter set cannot be big, a contradiction. □

Let us fix a map $\psi : \mathcal{G} \to \omega_1$ such that $\psi^{-1}(\alpha)$ is countable for all α, and $\psi(G)$ satisfies Lemma 3.6 for G, i.e., $G = p_\beta^{-1}[p_\beta[G]]$ for all $\beta \geq \psi(G)$. For every α let us consider the set $C_\alpha = \{z \in I^{\omega_1} : p_\beta(z) \in p_\beta[X]$ for all $\beta < \alpha$, $p_\alpha(z) \notin p_\alpha[X]$, and $z \notin G$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\psi(G) < \alpha\}$. Note that C_α depends on ψ.

We shall need the following game of length ω: In the nth round Player I chooses an open covering $\mathcal{U}_n$ of X, and Player II responds by choosing a finite $\mathcal{V}_n \subset \mathcal{U}_n$. Player II wins the game if $\bigcup_{n\in\omega}\bigcup\mathcal{V}_n = X$. Otherwise, Player I wins. We shall call this game *the Menger game* on X. Since X is Menger, Player I has no winning strategy in this game on X, see [4] or [9, Theorem 13].

Lemma 3.10. *The set $\Lambda = \{\alpha : C_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}$ is unbounded in ω_1.*

Proof. Given $\alpha_0 \in \omega_1$, we shall find $\alpha > \alpha_0$ such that $C_\alpha \neq \emptyset$. Now we shall describe a strategy of Player I in the Menger game on X.

Round 0. Set $A_0 = X$. Since A_0 is big and productively Lindelöf, by Lemma 3.8 there exists a compact $K_0 \subset p_{\alpha_0}[A_0]$ such that $A_0' := A_0 \cap p_{\alpha_0}^{-1}[K_0]$ is big. Let $G_0 \in \mathcal{G}$ be such that $\psi(G_0) < \alpha_0$. Since $A_0' \setminus G_0$ is big and non-big sets are closed under countable unions, there exists an open set $S_0 \supset G_0$ such that $p_\beta^{-1}[p_\beta[S_0]] = S_0$ for all $\beta \geq \psi(G_0)$, and $A_0'' := A_0' \setminus S_0$ is big. By Lemma 3.9 applied to A_0'' there exists $\alpha_1 > \alpha_0$ and $\mathcal{W}_0 \in \mathrm{O}(p_{\alpha_1}[A_0''])$ such that $A_0'' \setminus p_{\alpha_1}^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}]$ is big for all $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{W}_0]^{<\omega}$. Then Player I starts by choosing the open covering $\mathcal{U}_0 = \{X \setminus A_0''\}\bigcup\{p_{\alpha_1}^{-1}[W] : W \in \mathcal{W}_0\}$ of X. Suppose that Player II replies by choosing $\{X \setminus A_0''\}\bigcup\{p_{\alpha_1}^{-1}[W] : W \in \mathcal{V}_0\}$ for some finite $\mathcal{V}_0 \subset \mathcal{W}_0$. Then we set $A_1 = A_0'' \setminus p_{\alpha_1}^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}_0]$. It follows from the above that A_1 is a big closed subspace of X.

Round n. Suppose that after $n-1$ rounds the set $A_n \subset X$ of those $x \in X$ which have not yet been covered by the choices of Player II, is closed[1] and big. Suppose also that in the course of the previous rounds player I has constructed ordinals $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_n$. Then player I acts basically in the same way as in round 0. For the sake of completeness we repeat the argument. Since A_n is big and productively Lindelöf, by Lemma 3.8 there exists a compact $K_n \subset p_{\alpha_n}[A_n]$ such that $A_n' := A_n\cap p_{\alpha_n}^{-1}[K_n]$ is big. Let $G_n \in \mathcal{G}$ be such that $\psi(G_n) < \alpha_n$. Since $A_n'\setminus G_n$ is big and non-big sets are closed under countable unions, there exists an open set $S_n \supset G_n$ such that $p_\beta^{-1}[p_\beta[S_n]] = S_n$ for all $\beta \geq \psi(G_n)$, and $A_n'' := A_n' \setminus S_n$ is big. By Lemma 3.9 applied to A_n'' there exists $\alpha_{n+1} > \alpha_n$ and $\mathcal{W}_n \in \mathrm{O}(p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[A_n''])$ such that $A_n'' \setminus p_{\alpha_{n+1}}^{-1}[\cup\mathcal{V}]$ is big for all $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{W}_n]^{<\omega}$. Then Player I plays by choosing the open covering $\mathcal{U}_n = \{X \setminus A_n''\}\bigcup\{p_{\alpha_{n+1}}^{-1}[W] : W \in \mathcal{W}_n\}$ of X. Suppose that Player II replies by choosing $\{X \setminus A_n''\}\bigcup\{p_{\alpha_{n+1}}^{-1}[W] : W \in \mathcal{V}_n\}$ for some finite $\mathcal{V}_n \subset \mathcal{W}_n$.

[1]It is always closed by the definition of the game.

Then we set $A_{n+1} = A''_n \setminus p^{-1}_{\alpha_{n+1}}[\cup\mathcal{V}_n]$. It follows from the above that A_{n+1} is a big closed subspace of X.

In addition, by choosing G_n in the nth round, Player I makes sure that each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\psi(G) < \sup_{k\in\omega} \alpha_k$ has been chosen, using some straightforward bookkeeping. This completes our definition of a strategy of player I.

Since X is Menger, this strategy cannot be winning, and hence there is a play in which Player I uses the strategy described above and looses. Let

$$\langle \alpha_n, A_n, A'_n, A''_n, \mathcal{W}_n, \mathcal{V}_n, K_n, G_n, S_n : n \in \omega\rangle$$

be the corresponding objects constructed in the course of this play. Since this play has been lost by Player I we have

$$X = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} (X \setminus A''_n) \cup \bigcup_{n\in\omega} p^{-1}_{\alpha_{n+1}}[\cup\mathcal{V}_n].$$

Letting $\alpha = \sup_{n\in\omega} \alpha_n$, we claim that $C_\alpha \supset K := \bigcap_{n\in\omega} p^{-1}_{\alpha_n}[K_n]$. Note that this would prove our lemma as K is non-empty because $\langle p^{-1}_{\alpha_n}[K_n] : n \in \omega\rangle$ is a decreasing sequence of compact subspaces of I^{ω_1}. Let us fix $z \in K$.

Given any $\beta < \alpha$, find n with $\beta < \alpha_n$. Then $p_{\alpha_n}(z) \in K_n \subset p_{\alpha_n}[A_n] \subset p_{\alpha_n}[X]$, and hence $p_\beta(z) \in p_\beta[X]$.

Let us fix $G \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\psi(G) < \alpha$. By the requirement on the strategy of the Player I we have made at the end of its definition, we have that $G = G_n$ for some $n \in \omega$. Then $p_{\alpha_{n+1}}(z) \in K_{n+1} \subset p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[A_{n+1}]$ and $A_{n+1} \cap S_n = A_{n+1} \cap p^{-1}_{\alpha_{n+1}}[p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[S_n]] = \emptyset$ by the construction. Therefore $p_{\alpha_{n+1}}(z) \notin p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[S_n]$ and hence $z \notin S_n \supset G_n$.

It suffices to show that $p_\alpha(z) \notin p_\alpha[X]$. Suppose to the contrary that $p_\alpha(z) = p_\alpha(x)$ for some $x \in X$. Two cases are possible.

1. $x \in X \setminus A''_n$ for some $n \in \omega$. Then $x \in X \setminus A_{n+1}$ since $A_{n+1} \subset A''_n$. By the construction of A_k we get that $p_\beta[A_k \setminus A_{k+1}] = p_\beta[A_k] \setminus p_\beta[A_{k+1}]$ for all $k \in \omega$ and $\beta \geq \alpha_{k+1}$. Indeed to get A_{k+1} we make several steps, and at each of them we remove from A_k a set T such that $T = p^{-1}_\beta[p_\beta[T]]$ for all $\beta \geq \alpha_{k+1}$. Since $X = A_0$, we have that $X \setminus A_{n+1} = \bigcup_{k\leq n}(A_k \setminus A_{k+1})$, and hence

$$p_{\alpha_{n+1}}(x) \in p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[X \setminus A_{n+1}] = p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[\bigcup_{k\leq n} (A_k \setminus A_{k+1})] =$$

$$= \bigcup_{k\leq n} p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[A_k] \setminus p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[A_{k+1}] = p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[X] \setminus p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[A_{n+1}].$$

However, $p_{\alpha_{n+1}}(x) = p_{\alpha_{n+1}}(z) \in K_{n+1} \subset p_{\alpha_{n+1}}[A_{n+1}]$, a contradiction.

2. $x \in p^{-1}_{\alpha_{n+1}}[\cup\mathcal{V}_n]$ for some $n \in \omega$. Then $x \in X \setminus A_{n+1}$ because $A_{n+1} = A''_n \setminus p^{-1}_{\alpha_{n+1}}[\cup\mathcal{V}_n]$ by the construction, and we have already seen in case 1 that $x \in X \setminus A_{n+1}$ leads to a contradiction. This completes our proof. □

Let us denote by Y the union $\bigcup_{\alpha\in\omega_1} C_\alpha$.

Lemma 3.11. *Y is Lindelöf.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an open covering Y. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mathcal{U}$ is closed under finite unions and taking open subsets of its elements. Let $\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B}_\alpha$. It suffices to show that $Y \subset \cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ for some α. Suppose that this is not the case, set $\mathcal{G}' = \mathcal{G} \cup \{\cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$, and extend ψ to $\mathcal{G}'$ by letting $\psi(\cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha) = \alpha$. We claim that X is not covered by any countable subfamily of $\mathcal{G}'$. Indeed, fix such a subfamily $\mathcal{G}''$ and find α with $\psi[\mathcal{G}''] \subset \alpha$, i.e., $\mathcal{G}'' \subset \{\cup\mathcal{U}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup \{G \in \mathcal{G} :$

$\psi(G) < \alpha\}$. Pick $z \in Y \setminus \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \cup\mathcal{U}_\beta = Y \setminus \cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha$. Then $z \in C_\gamma$ for some $\gamma > \alpha$ by the following

Claim 3.12. *$C_\xi \subset \bigcup_{\eta<\xi} \cup\mathcal{U}_\eta = \mathcal{U}_\xi$ for all $\xi < \omega_1$.*

Proof. Given $u \in C_\xi$, set $K_u = \{p_\xi(u)\} \times I^{\omega_1 \setminus \xi}$ and note that K_u is a compact subspace of Y. Since $K_u \subset \cup\mathcal{U}$, there exists a finite $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ and an open set $U = \prod_{\eta\in\omega_1} U_\eta$, where $U_\eta = I$ for all $\eta \notin F$ for some finite $F \subset \omega_1$, and U_η is an interval with rational end-points for all $\eta \in F$, with the following properties:

$$u \in K_u \subset U \subset \cup\mathcal{V}.$$

$U \in \mathcal{U}$ by our convention. Moreover, U_η must obviously be equal to I for all $\eta \geq \xi$, and hence $U \in \mathcal{U}_\xi$. □

We proceed with the proof of Lemma 3.11. Since $z \in C_\gamma$ for some $\gamma > \alpha$, we have $z \notin G$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\psi(G) < \alpha$, and hence $z \notin G$ for any $G \in \mathcal{G}''$. Pick $x \in X$ such that $p_\alpha(x) = p_\alpha(z)$ and note that $x \notin G$ for any $G \in \mathcal{G}''$ because $G = p_\alpha^{-1}[p_\alpha[G]]$ for all such G.

Now repeating the proof of Lemma 3.10 for $\mathcal{G}'$ and ψ extended to $\mathcal{G}'$, we get that there exists $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that the set $C'_\alpha = \{z \in I^{\omega_1} : p_\beta(z) \in p_\beta[X]$ for all $\beta < \alpha$, $p_\alpha(z) \notin p_\alpha[X]$, and $z \notin G$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}'$ such that $\psi(G) < \alpha\}$ is non-empty. However, $C'_\alpha = C_\alpha \setminus \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \cup\mathcal{U}_\beta = C_\alpha \setminus \cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ by the definition of $\mathcal{G}'$ and $\psi \restriction \mathcal{G}' \setminus \mathcal{G}$, and $C_\alpha \setminus \cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \emptyset$ by Claim 3.12, a contradiction. □

Lemma 3.13. *Let U be an open neighborhood of Y. Then $X \setminus U \subset \cup\mathcal{H}$ for some countable $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the family of all open subsets of U and $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ be the intersection $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B}_\alpha$. In the proof of Lemma 3.11 we have established that there exists $\alpha \in \omega_1$ and $\mathcal{H} \in [\mathcal{G}]^\omega$ such that $X \subset \cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha \cup \bigcup\mathcal{H}$. (More precisely, by the last paragraph of the proof of Lemma 3.11 we have a contradiction if $X \not\subset \cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha \cup \bigcup\mathcal{H}$ for all α and $\mathcal{H} \in [\mathcal{G}]^\omega$). Therefore $X \setminus U \subset X \setminus \cup\mathcal{U}_\alpha \subset \cup\mathcal{H}$. □

We can finish now the proof of Theorem 3.3 by deriving a contradiction from X being big as follows. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ and pick $x_\alpha \in X \setminus \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} G_\beta$. Consider the space $Z = \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \cup Y$ with the following topology τ: all x_α's are isolated, and the basic open neighborhoods of $y \in Y$ have the form $U \cap Z$, where $U \ni y$ is open in I^{ω_1}. (Z, τ) is Lindelöf: $(Y, \tau \restriction Y)$ is Lindelöf by Lemma 3.11, and by Lemma 3.13 and the definition of τ we have that $Z \setminus U$ is countable for any open $U \in \tau$ containing Y. Now $X \times Z$ is not Lindelöf when Z is considered with the topology τ as $\{(x_\alpha, x_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is a closed discrete uncountable subspace of this product, a contradiction to X being productively Lindelöf.

4. Weakly Alster spaces

The inspiration for the results in this section is the characterization for Hurewicz spaces presented in Theorem 6 of [10]:

Theorem 4.1 (Tall)**.** *A regular Lindelöf space X is Hurewicz if, and only if, for every Čech complete space $G \supset X$ there is a σ-compact space K such that $X \subset K \subset G$.*

The standard definition for Hurewicz spaces is in terms of a selection principle involving γ-coverings. It was proved in [10, Theorem 7] that every regular Alster space is Hurewicz. And, as in the previous section, the Alster property implies productively Lindelöf. In this section, we present a new definition, called weakly Alster, that is in between the Alster and productively Lindelöf properties. It is not know by us if this new property is actually equivalent to any of the other two in general. But one advantage is that the relation between weakly Alster and Hurewicz properties is immediate because of Theorem 4.1.

Definition 4.2. *Let X be a regular space. We say that it is* weakly Alster *if for every covering $\mathcal{G}$ made by G_δ sets of βX such that $\{G \cap X : G \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is an Alster covering for X, there is a σ-compact space $Y \subset \beta X$ such that $X \subset Y \subset \bigcup \mathcal{G}$.*

Proposition 4.3. *Every Alster space is weakly Alster.*

Proof. Let X be an Alster space. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a covering for X as in the definition of weakly Alster. We may suppose, taking a refinement if necessary, that for each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ there is a sequence $(A_n^G)_{n\in\omega}$ of open sets in βX such that $G = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} A_n^G$ and $cl_{\beta X}(A_{n+1}^G) \subset A_n^G$ for all n. In other words, we may assume that each $G \in \mathcal{G}$ is compact. Since X is Alster and $\{X \cap G : G \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is an Alster cover of X, there is a sequence $(G_n)_{n\in\omega}$ of elements of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $X \subset \bigcup_{n\in\omega} G_n$. This completes our proof. □

Proposition 4.4. *Every weakly Alster space is productively Lindelöf.*

Proof. Let X be a weakly Alster space and let Z be a Lindelöf space. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a basic open covering for $X \times Z$. We may suppose that, for each compact $K \subset X$ and each $z \in Z$, there are open sets $A_{K,z}, B_{K,z}$ such that $K \times \{z\} \subset A_{K,z} \times B_{K,z} \in \mathcal{C}$. Also, we may suppose that each $A_{K,z}$ is an open set in βX. Since Z is Lindelöf, for each compact $K \subset X$, there is a sequence $(z_n)_{n\in\omega}$ (depending on K) such that $K \times Z \subset \bigcup_{n\in\omega} A_{K,z_n} \times B_{K,z_n}$. Let $G_K = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} A_{K,y_n}$. Let $Y \subset \beta X$ be a σ-compact such that $X \subset Y \subset \bigcup_{K\in\mathcal{K}(X)} G_K$.

Fix $(y, z) \in Y \times Z$. Let K be such that $y \in G_K$. Let z_n be such that $z \in B_{K,z_n}$. Note that $(y, z_n) \in A_{K,z_n} \times B_{K,z_n}$. Since Y is σ-compact, there is a countable subcovering for $Y \times Z$. Note that this is also a countable subcovering for $X \times Z$. □

Since under CH, productively Lindelöf and Alster is the same for Tychonoff spaces with weight $\leq \aleph_1$, the following questions are natural:

Question 4.5. *Is every productively Lindelöf Tychonoff space a weakly Alster space? Under CH?*

Question 4.6. *Is every weakly Alster space an Alster space under CH?*

Question 4.7. *Is every Tychonoff weakly Alster space with weight $\leq \mathfrak{c}$ an Alster space?*

References

[1] Alas, O.; Aurichi, L.F.; Junqueira, L.R.; Tall, F.D., *Non-productively Lindelöf spaces and small cardinals,* Houston J. Math. **37** (2011), 1373–1381.

[2] Alster, K., *On the class of all spaces of weight not greater than ω_1 whose Cartesian product with every Lindelöf space is Lindelöf,* Fund. Math. **129** (1986), 133–140.

[3] Duanmu, H,; Tall, F.D.; Zdomskyy, L., *Productively Lindelöf and Indestructibly Lindelöf Spaces,* Topology and its Applications **160** (2013), 2443–2453.

[4] Hurewicz, W., *Über die Verallgemeinerung des Borellschen Theorems*, Math. Z. **24** (1925), 401–421.
[5] Michael, E., *The product of a normal space and a metric space need not be normal,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1963), 375–376.
[6] Moore, J.T., *Some of the combinatorics related to Michael's problem,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1999), 2459–2467.
[7] T. C. Przymusiński, *Products of normal spaces,* Handbook of set-theoretic topology (K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1984), 781-826.
[8] Repovš, D.; Zdomskyy, L., *On the Menger covering property and D-spaces,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140** (2012), 1069–1074.
[9] Scheepers, M., *Combinatorics of open covers. I. Ramsey theory,* Topology Appl. **69** (1996), 31–62.
[10] Tall, F., *Lindelöf spaces which are Menger, Hurewicz, Alster, productive, or D,* Top. Appl. **158** (2011), 2556–2563.

Instituto de Ciências Matemáticas e de Computação, Universidade de São Paulo, Caixa Postal 668, São Carlos, SP, 13560-970, Brazil
E-mail address: aurichi@icmc.usp.br

Kurt Goedel Research Center for Mathematical Logic, University of Vienna, Waehringer Strasse 25, A-1090 Wien, Austria
E-mail address: lzdomsky@gmail.com
URL: http://www.logic.univie.ac.at/~lzdomsky/